

REMARKS

Claim 1, line 10 has been amended to recite a disk tray, rather than a “reading disk,” thereby overcoming the rejection under 35 USC §112, 2nd Paragraph.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,658,202 (Battaglia) and 6,654,843 (Wakeley) is respectfully requested on the grounds that the Battaglia and Wakeley patents fail to disclose or suggest, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, a transmission exchange device for compact disks and silicon disks which can:

- a. exchange data between a host computer and a silicon disk or compact disk, and
- b. exchange data directly between either the compact disk and the silicon disk.

In fact, neither reference discloses any sort of **direct exchange of data between two removable memory disks**, much less between a silicon disk (or flash memory) and a compact disk. The Battaglia patent concerns *exchange of data with an internal memory or host computer* (and not exchange of data between removable (inserted) memories), while the Wakeley patent concerns *connection and disconnection of devices from a host computer* (which involves exchange of data with a host, but again does not involve exchange of data between removable (inserted) memories, and in particular exchange of data between a removable flash memory and a compact disk).

As noted in the previous response, the Battaglia patent fails to disclose direct data exchange between an inserted compact disk and an inserted silicon disk, and in fact does not disclose any sort of direct data exchange between *inserted* disks of any kind. While the internal hard drive 20 of Battaglia can be fixed or removable from the housing (col. 3, lines 53-65), the disk within the hard drive is not removable from the hard drive, and there is no disclosure that the mass storage device 20 of Battaglia can be a compact disk received in a compact disk tray, as claimed

The newly-cited Wakeley patent, on the other hand, fails to even disclose two memory devices between which data could possibly be exchanged, much less direct data exchange between an inserted compact disk and an inserted silicon disk. Instead, the Wakeley patent concerns “hot swapping” of devices. At best, hot swapping involves data exchange with a host computer. It does not involve **direct** data exchange between removable memories, as claimed.

Instead of suggesting data exchange between two **inserted memory disks**, the Battaglia patent discloses a data exchange device that can exchange data between an **internal mass storage** or **host computer** and either of two removable flash memories. The Battaglia patent does not disclose a **compact disk** reader, or direct transfer of data from an inserted compact disk to the flash memory (silicon disk). While the Battaglia patent discloses an optional flash memory slot, there is no disclosure of data exchange between the two flash memories.

The Wakeley patent could not possibly have made up for this deficiency. It is true that Wakeley teaches that compact disk device can use an IDE bus. However, the IDE bus taught by Wakeley is not used to directly transfer data between an inserted compact disk device and an inserted silicon disk device. Since the IDE bus of Battaglia is also not used to directly transfer data between removable devices, and the Battaglia patent does not explicitly *or implicitly* suggest such a direct transfer, it cannot reasonably be said that the combination of Battaglia and Wakeley could possibly have suggested such a transfer.

Claim 1 specifically recites “*an independent use mode, in which by operation of said circuit board, said chip sets and said microprocessing unit, **direct data exchange between said compact disk and said silicon disk is executed.***” The Battaglia patent does not include such a mode. Neither of the references cited by the Examiner even remotely includes such a mode, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection of claims is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Ser. No. 09/973,740

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Urcia', followed by a long horizontal line.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: January 18, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB\S\Producer\ben\Pending A...IFC\CHEN 973740\03.wpd